

# Extrasensory Perception As a Natural, But Not Supernatural Phenomenon

Alexander Ya Temkin

## Abstract

In the present article the results of observations are considered 1) of a person A by another person B and 2) by himself when he is in such a state that he is not able to determine his place in space and time (we call such a state *meditation state*). It was shown that results of these two kinds of measurements are complementary reciprocally, if to express it in quantum terms. This consideration shows how a person in the meditation state can obtain information on the past and the future, as well as on places being at the large, even big distances (e. g., even in other Galaxy), while from the point of view of the person B he, A, did not change his place in space-time. It is important that among the information obtained A being in the meditation state is the one on somebody thinking, i. e., A in the meditation state is able to the *telepathy* with other human being in other places of space-time. It is clarified that the telepathic information is transferred in space and time by *human wave de-Broglie*, but not by any radiation. It is very important because the propagation velocity of De-Broglie waves is not limited by the light velocity, and can reach any point of the Universe in zero time. It can be important for space research and communications between space crafts. However, communications using human De-Broglie waves, for example, telepathy, are not reliable (exactly, much less reliable than ordinary electromagnetic communications, e. g., the radio ones): a message may be lost partially or completely, may be distorted. It would be interesting to study this problem in detail. The concept of observer is introduced and studied in the connection with the human thinking. Our approach allows one to define the concept of soul, personality in mathematical terms, and to introduce the notion of states of mind.

**Key Words:** ESP, extrasensory perception, de Broglie wave, quantum mechanics

NeuroQuantology 2011; 1: 157-165

## Introduction

In (Temkin 1999; Ch. 4) the concentration of *one person* on different subjects of *his* thinking was considered. In the present article we shall consider the situation when *one person A* can be concentrated or on the processing of the information on the surrounding world provided by his organs of sense (maybe with the help of measuring instruments) or on the study of his own

thinking processes, while *another person B* is occupied all the time with the receipt of the information on the person *A* and surrounding world, using with this purpose observations and measurings. Our approach corresponds to the one of the modern physics that is based on the recognition that 1) the description of physical phenomena principally depends upon the nature and state of measuring instruments and observers interpreting the results of measurements; 2) the set of all possible measuring instruments can be divided into reciprocally complementary sub-sets such that it is impossible to perform simultaneously measurements by

Corresponding author: Alexander Ya Temkin

Address: : **Alexander Ya Temkin**, Department of Physical Electronics, Faculty of Engineering, Wolfson Building, Tel-Aviv University, Ramat-Aviv, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel

Phone: + 972 -3-9693098 (home)

e-mail: temkin@eng.tau.ac.il

Received Jan 9, 2011. Revised Jan 12, 2011. Accepted Feb 6, 2011

instruments belonging to different sub-sets; 3) for instruments belonging to each of these sub-sets their own reality exists; there is no reality independent of the kind of measuring instruments (Einstein 1905; 1953; Bergman 1942; Bohr 1928; 1934; 1935; Dirac 1958; Heitler 1956; Heisenberg 1930; Shiff 1955; Messiah 1961). For example, an electron has a co-ordinate, but not the corresponding linear momentum for one class of measurements, but for the other class of measurements it has linear momentum, but not the corresponding co-ordinate. To consider measurements performed on human beings with the purpose of providing information on their states, thinking processes, *etc.*, it must be taken into account that a person  $A$  can himself measure his state as well as his thinking processes and interpret the results of these measurements, i.e., he is at the same time a measuring instrument and an observer of himself, which is impossible in the world of elementary particles. An elementary particle is too primitive, and so it can only be an object of measurements.

Thus, the set of measuring instruments (together with observers) necessary to measure the state of a man  $A$  consists of the man  $A$  himself and all other men  $B_i$ . A man  $B_i$  can measure time, all co-ordinates, configurations a. o. geometrical and mechanical parameters of  $A$ , as well as some physical, chemical and physiological quantities of  $A$ . He can also obtain some information on the thinking processes of  $A$  from speaking with  $A$ , from psychological tests, from electroencephalography (EEG), *etc.*, but such information is very limited and not exact. Maximum information on his thinking processes can be provided by  $A$  himself to  $A$  himself, *if he is concentrated on them*. But at the same time he deprives himself of information about the time, co-ordinates, his own configurations and other geometrical, physical and physiological quantities, which are measurable by all  $B_i$ . A similar situation occurs when  $A$  is sleeping (and dreaming) or is in a hypnotic state. For short, we shall call *meditation states* all such states of  $A$  in which he is able to obtain maximum information about his own thinking processes. We see that in our case, as well as in quantum mechanics, all

measuring instruments are divided into two incompatible classes: 1) the man  $A$  himself, and 2) all other men  $B_i$ . In quantum mechanics, for example, they are 1) instruments measuring co-ordinates and 2) those measuring the corresponding linear momenta. These two classes (or sub-sets) of measuring instruments are reciprocally complementary. This principle of complementarity in quantum mechanics was formulated by Nils Bohr. In his lectures (Bohr 1933; 1937), Bohr mentioned arguments that this principle and the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg are also valid for biological systems. An uncertainty principle represents relations between errors of measurements of the same object, performed simultaneously by two reciprocally complementary measuring instruments: for example, measurements of the co-ordinate and the corresponding linear momentum of an electron (in quantum mechanics) or measurements of the state of a person  $A$  performed simultaneously by  $A$  and by  $B_i$  in the considered case. If  $A$  is in a state of meditation, his reality does not contain his localization in space and time, but it contains, for example, his dreams and other things produced by his brain. It is not less real than for all  $B_i$  the localization of  $A$  in space and time as well as other parameters measurable by  $B_i$  are real.

This means that for  $A$  his own reality exists and for a  $B_i$  his own reality exists. Any discussion about which of these realities *is more real* is nonsense, like the discussion about what is more real: that an electron has a co-ordinate or the corresponding linear momentum. If being in a meditation state  $A$  "sees" that he is in another place (maybe in another country) in an epoch other than the one determined by a  $B_i$  by means his measurements, it is still the reality for  $A$ , the data forming the reality of  $B_i$  do not exist for him. This means that the clairvoyance, the "memory" of events of hundreds years ago, meetings with persons who are in other towns or even other countries, *etc.*, represents consequences of uncertainty and complementarity as properties of the human thinking. For example, it is possible that in  $B_i$ 's reality  $A$  is in Paris at noon on June 30, 1996, while in  $A$ 's reality he is in London in

Shakespeare's time, or, on the contrary, in London in the year 2100. It may seem that the person  $B_i$  is superfluous because the uncertainties responsible for extrasensory perception (ESP) phenomena arise as a consequence of  $A$  concentrating on his thinking processes. However, this opinion would be not correct because  $A$ 's "travel" in space and time has meaning only relative to  $B$ 's measurements of  $A$ 's position in space and time, while from  $A$ 's point of view he does not "travel", in general, but really in those places and epochs. The fact that the thinking of only one person produces different realities depending on its concentration on different subjects of the thinking means that the considered creation of different realities *when two persons  $A$  and  $B_i$  are involved* (that is the mechanism of ESP) loses its exclusiveness and becomes a particular case of more general phenomenon. This in its turn means that in particular the *parapsychology becomes simply an aspect of psychology characterized by a certain concentration of the mind*, losing its character as something special, existing separately from natural, or may be even something supernatural, mystic, esoteric, as many people think.

### On Observer

In the classical mechanics it was supposed that a) errors of measurements are results of the imperfection of our measuring apparatus and *principally* can be reduced to the zero by the subsequent, step by step improvement of the measuring techniques, and b) properties of the observer and even his existence itself are not important. The theory built on the grounds of these principles did not take into account errors of the measurements, the observer existence and his properties as well as the measurement as the source of the information on the examined object. It reflects the intention to create *the (not an!) objective* picture of the World as a perfect one, independent of human beings with their imperfect measuring equipment and brain. The World was considered perfect, and it was unacceptable to spoil its perfection.

The relativity and quantum mechanics have rejected this point of view and the scientific approach to the physical

World study based on it. Simply because it was impossible to build on this grounds a physical theory able to explain new experimental facts.

The new physics rejected the oversimplified concept of the objectivity of physical theory created by the absolutization of the classical mechanics which, really, is no more than *one of possible models* for the approximate description of a certain class of physical phenomena. There was (and still is) a very difficult psychological problem: our personality is created mainly by our every-day-life experience. The information on the surrounding World is provided by our organs of senses. Such an experience continues during the whole life confirming and reinforcing this personality structure. All that is in the framework of this personality structure, is (often) unwillingly interpreted by us as natural, correct and objective. The whole "great" philosophy (the materialistic philosophy) was created on these grounds. This philosophy *really* is not so great, but simply expresses in never-ending fluxes of high-flown words and phrases the point of view that only such a theory can be considered as acceptable that can be squeezed into the framework of concepts and views *engendered by our every-day life*. No more. The materialistic philosophy is now the main obstacle in the scientific progress. It influences the thinking of scientists limiting it artificially because its demands and conditions seem very natural and fundamental, even unquestionable. In addition, even in the Free World any theory contradicting to the materialistic philosophy meets serious objections in the community of scientists, not to mention communist countries where it is considered as a heavy crime (ideological diversion) that merits a cruel punishment up to long term jail in prison camps.

The modern physics recognizes the fundamental role of measurements in physical theory and introduced the concept of observer to the theory. However, only the fact of its existence is taken into account, but not his/its properties. Consider this problem in more detail. The observer can be a human being or a computer. His tasks are to plan measurements, to perform them by means of measuring instruments and to interpret their

results on the grounds of theories (models) that he has. They can be theories already existed or a new one that needs checking by measurements. If no of such theories is fit for the interpretation of new measurements made by (the observer + measuring equipment), a new theory should be created for this purpose. It is clear that *without interpretation made by the observer measurements' results provide no information.*

In physics, however, an observer is considered simply as a physical body, its/his own properties and activity are not considered. At the same time taking into account the observer's properties and activity can lead to changes of physical laws and, generally speaking, of those in other fields of science. Indeed, an observer-human being or an observer-automaton has an enormous number of states. Their activity in the interpretation of measurements' results means an enormous number of all kinds of transitions between these states. Such a transition has, maybe small, but finite duration in time. This means, the information provided by the observer refers not to the time when we have gotten its output, but to the past, maybe close past, but past. Moreover, if the transfer of this information from one observer to another is considered, not only the time of the signal propagation (with the light velocity) between these two observers must be taken into account, but also the time necessary to emit the detailed information on all interstate transfers of the first observer, to accept and decode it by the second observer. It is a very important point because transformation laws in physics are based on the consideration of the information transfer from one reference system to another. There is one way to shorten the time necessary to forward, accept and decode the information: instead to transfer the whole information from the first observer to the second one, to limit it by an incomplete information. Then an inequality is expected to be between the error in information obtained and decoded by the second observer, and the time delay, in other words, an uncertainty principle between the transferred information and time delay. Thus, for example, the validity of Lorentz transformations in the case of living systems becomes questionable, and,

therefore, for example, the Twin Paradox must be reconsidered.

### **Human Waves of de Broglie**

In (Temkin, 1999; 2011) it was argued that the behavior of the mind is described by an algebra of non-commuting operators acting upon points of the metric space of states of the mind, in other words, that the mind is a quantum system. As it was written there, such a point  $\psi$  depends on the set of thoughts existing in the mind. When  $A$  is in a meditation state, among these thoughts are those on his location in the space and time. Then the point  $\psi$  is his wave function in space and time (as function of the corresponding variables), i. e., his De Broglie wave, and we shall call it *human wave of De Broglie*. Now the mechanism of the telepathy and other ESP phenomena can be expressed in terms of human waves of De Broglie: this function is delocalized in space and time (when  $A$  is in a meditation state!) and may be overlapped with the De Broglie wave of another person  $A'$  that may lead to their interaction being resulted of the initiation of thoughts in the mind of  $A'$  by those existing in the mind of  $A$ , and vice versa. Why there are so much "may"? This situation is like the overlapping of wave functions of two fields in the quantum theory of fields. But they interact only if the interaction constant is non-zero. Thus, to get rid off of these "may" it is to check theoretically or experimentally whether something corresponding in the considered case to the fields' interaction constant is non-zero. To understand why the overlapping of  $A$ 's and  $A'$ 's wave functions may lead to ESP phenomena, e. g., telepathy, it must take into account that the wave function depends not only on space co-ordinates and time, but also on all other sets of thoughts. There is a principle difference between the considered case and the case of two-particle (e. g., two electrons) system in quantum mechanics. In the considered case the set of variables corresponds to that measured by  $A$  or by  $A'$ , while in the case of two electrons (or other quantum particles) the set of variables includes the linear momenta (or co-ordinates) and spins of both particles. This difference is a consequence of the fact that measurements upon the system of two



electron are made by an external observer (by his measuring instruments), while those made upon the system  $A + A'$  are performed by  $A$  or by  $A'$ . The delocalization of the wave function of  $A_1$  and/or  $A_2$  can lead to their overlapping in a certain region of space and time. In this region the wave function of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  can interact as two overlapped quantum fields interact, *if their interaction constant is non-zero*. If this interaction exists, the thinking processes of  $A_1$  can influence the thinking of  $A_2$  and vice versa. The point  $\psi$  of the metric space of states of the mind is a function of the set of thoughts existing in the mind, therefore, inside the region of the overlapping of the wave functions of two persons ACRs existing in one mind can initiate ACRs in the second mind, in other words, to realize the telepathic communication between  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . Thus, *the telepathy is realized by human waves of De Broglie* represented by the above mentioned  $\psi$ -functions, but not any kind of radiation and, therefore, 1) the velocity of the telepathem propagation is not limited with the light velocity, and 2) screens shielding electromagnetic waves do not prevent the telepathem propagation. These two consequences of the proposed theory allows one to check it experimentally: a) telepathy between persons separated by cosmic distances can be used to determine the telepathem propagation velocity and whether it is really not limited with the light velocity; b) experiments with screens can show whether or not they prevent the telepathy (for example, a layer of water between sender of telepathems being on the earth surface and recipient being in a submarine deep in the water is such a screen).

### ESP, Personality and States of Mind

If two atoms are considered, the ability of one of them to absorb photons emitted by the second one depends on the quantum level set structures of the both atoms and on their state at the moment of photon emission. By the analogy it can be expected that the telepathic communication (Leek 1971; Murphy 1961; Rogo 1975; Rhine 1975; Sinclair 1971; Hunt 1964) between two persons A and B depends on structures of

their personalities and the actual states of their minds. Consider it more in detail by taking into account that the personality is defined for a given representation of the mind, i.e. for a given concentration of the thinking. Firstly, the both communicated minds (or at least one of them) must be concentrated each on its own thinking processes to achieve the delocalization in space and time, which makes the telepathy possible (Temkin, 1982). However, in the framework of such concentration, each mind can be concentrated on various subjects of the thinking. If the sender and the recipient are concentrated on the same subject of the thinking, i.e. are in the same representation, then telepathems are able to influence the conscious processes of the recipient. It can be experimentally checked in the following way. The recipient must be instructed that at a certain time interval he must think of a given subject chosen so that there is a difficulty at a certain point of the reasoning and the recipient does not know how to advance beyond this point. If, for example, both persons know the mathematics, the chosen subject may be the proof of a theorem. During the first trial the recipient works without help of the sender. During the second trial the sender performs the same work as the recipient, but the sender knows how to advance at this difficult point. In this case, then his telepathems may complete the knowledge of the recipient and the last will perform the reasoning up to the experiment termination. In fact, even without this telepathic help some probability exists that the recipient will cope with his task. Because of this a large number of such trials is necessary to compare probabilities of recipient success with and without the telepathic help. We have discussed the telepathic communication between two minds occupied with conscious thinking. Consider now the telepathy when the sender is occupied with conscious thinking on the same subject as in the previous series of trials, e.g., he is proving the same mathematical theorem, while the recipient begins to think about quite another subject, e.g., his forthcoming weekend, *since he unsuccessfully attempted to cope with the abovementioned difficulty at the given step of the reasoning*. According to our work he may continue to think, *but subconsciously*,

about the subject of the first series of trials, and may detect the results of this subconscious thinking when he returns to the conscious thinking about the previous subject. Therefore, if the telepathem is accepted when he thinks subconsciously on this subject, it could help the recipient to accomplish his task. Thus, two parallel series of trials can be performed to compare the probabilities of the recipient's success with and without the telepathic help. Of course, each trial must include the change of his representation (concentration) at the two certain stages mentioned. By this way the existence of the telepathic communication when the recipient thinks subconsciously, could be checked. The comparison of the probabilities obtained in this experiment and in the first one could reveal the connection between the consciousness and telepathy. These probabilities are calculated as repetition frequencies of corresponding issues. If to continue the analogy with two atoms emitting and absorbing photons, it could be expected that telepathy is more probable between two persons with the same (or, exactly, similar) personalities. However in the case where dominating personality of the recipient is quite different from the one of the sender, another basic personality of the recipient may have the structure close to the one of the dominating personality of the sender. Telepathems can then be received by means of this basic personality (Temkin, 1982). Of course, as it is seen from this reasoning, it is not obligatory that at least one of personalities (of the sender or recipient) would be dominating one. The telepathic communication can be realized by basic, but not obligatory by dominating personalities of both persons. Telepathic experiments with pairs of twins compared with those when sender and recipient are not relatives, would help to establish connection between telepathy and personalities. Notice that sometimes twins may have quite different personalities, and therefore the similarity (exact identity evidently does not exist) of their personalities must be checked before the beginning of the proposed experiments.

Notice that the telepathem can be received not obligatory by the dominant personality (Temkin 1999; 2011) of the recipient, but also by one of his other basic

personalities (Temkin, 1999; 2011). In this case the reasoning of this Section are referred to the likeness of the sender personality "responsible" for the sending the telepathem (it also can be not his dominating one) and that of recipient's basic personalities which accepts the telepathem. In view of this it would be reasonable to suppose that individuals like Wolf Messing in the USSR, who are able to "read thoughts" of different persons having different personalities, have comparable probabilities of their basic personalities, possibly, none of them (*defined in the representation when such man is concentrated on the "reading of thoughts"*) is the dominating one. For such a man "voices" that he hears can be produced by the interference of his different basic personalities and be a symptom of a mental disease, if he is not able to establish that this is their source, but not the external world. But "voices" can also be produced by telepathems sent by different external sources, and in this case his talking about "stories" that he "heard" cannot be considered as a symptom of mental disease, even if these stories seemed very strange. Just as a non-stationary perturbation of a quantum mechanical system can provoke its transitions from one state to others, the telepathic influence on a person, depending on time (non-stationary), can provoke transition from a state with one dominating personality to a state with another dominating personality, in other words, the change of his personality. This means, the brainwashing can be accomplished by the telepathy.

### **Soul and ESP**

The concept of mind (Temkin, 1999) includes CRs ("raw materials for thoughts") as well as ACRs (thoughts) as realized CRs. It is evident that when the mind consists only of CRs, the human being is dead. Thus, ACRs (thoughts) form an especially important subset of the mind that merits to be identified with a very important attribute of human beings such that without it life is impossible. To reflect this fact the following definition is introduced:

## DEFINITION

*SOUL-t IS THE SET OF ALL ACRs (THOUGHTS) EXISTING IN THE BRAIN OF A PERSON AT A GIVEN MOMENT t OF TIME.*

Without the soul-t a human being is dead because then his mind consists only of CRs. It is clear that the soul-t defined above depends on time.

Perhaps a "massive" telepathy is possible when all thoughts of a person (existing at a given moment of time) are accepted by a recipient. In our terms this means that the recipient got the soul-t of the sender. Perhaps, the phenomenon of *reincarnation* (Rogo 1975; Rhine 1975; Hunt 1964; Parker 1975) can be explained on these grounds, if we take into consideration also "travels" in space and time to include the reincarnation when two participating persons are separated in time and/or space. However, it must remember that soul-t must not be identified with the *soul* used in the poetry, religion *etc.* The latter is apparently something characterizing a human being very profoundly, almost independently of the time, a characteristic existing constantly, may be only weakly depending on the time.

At the death of a person the realization of CRs is stopped irreversibly which, according to the definition of soul-t, means that "the soul-t leaves him". With this connection it would be interesting to think about the possibility of soul-t transfer to another person just during the dying process because this process provokes the rapid change of the ACRs set. If at a certain stage of dying the human being loses his contact with the outside world and is able to be concentrated only on his thinking processes, then in his reality he may be at a time and at a place occupied by another person. For this second human being this rapid change of the ACRs set could create a rapidly changed perturbation of his mind, which increases the probability of thoughts transfer. This last conclusion was made by the *analogy* with the quantum mechanical perturbation theory and so is only a hypothesis needed for scientific proof. It would be interesting to check whether the telepathy, including the "massive" telepathy, i. e., the transfer of a set of thoughts (that may be, in particular, the

soul-t) can be described in terms of thoughts' radiation and absorption, and to try to construct with this purpose an analogue of the second quantization and Fock columns (Heitler 1954; Fock 1932) in the proposed quantum theory of states of mind, which, in particular, can be applied to processes of the thoughts and their combinations emission and absorption by mind. If future researches confirm that it is possible, the following processes should be considered: a) a thought (or thoughts) emitted by a person *A* is absorbed by another person *B*, b) a thought (or thoughts) emitted by *A* is absorbed by *A* himself (virtual emission), c) the structure of *A*'s mind was changed abruptly after the thought (or thoughts) emission so that it already is not able to absorb this thought (or these thoughts) and there is no other person able to do it, then it (they) remains free. The option c) may be a result of the death of *A*, and if the emitted thoughts form his soul-t, it remains free in the space at least for some time. However, one must be extremely careful in that what concerns hypotheses in the ESP field, not forgetting that they are only a subject of future researches, and not yet results of a theory. This caution is necessary to remain in the framework of the science, but not to replace it carelessly by science-fiction.

## On the Telepathic Brainwashing

If *A* receives telepathems from *B* who emits them with the purpose to thrust his opinion onto *A*, or even to thrust onto *A* that all fundamental ways of thinking of *A* are nonsense and must be replaced by those thrust by *B* (brainwashing), it is important whether *A* is concentrated on the subject of telepathems or not. If he is concentrated on the subject(s) of the telepathem, he can check thoughts induced in his mind by the telepathems and to reject those of them that he considers as incorrect.

Thus, in this case the attempt of *B* brainwashing can be rejected. This means, the attempt of *B* brainwashing is expected to be successful, if *A* is in a state when *trial sets of thoughts* (Temkin, 1999; 2011) content is other than the content of telepathems, i. e., when *A* is not concentrated on the telepathem subject area. Then telepathems can create in *A*'s mind

thoughts that cannot be checked by trial sets of thoughts existing in *A*'s mind in the considered representation. From these "injected" thoughts new trial sets of thoughts can be constructed, and, as a consequence, criterions of *A*'s thoughts correctness will be checked by these new, originated from *B*, trial sets of thoughts.

### Conclusions

The principal result of the present work is to show that the telepathy is realized by the human waves of De Broglie rather than by a kind of radiation. This mechanism was expressed, in other terms, so that the existence of the telepathy is a result of uncertainties of time and space location of a person from his own point of view when he is concentrated on his thinking processes. It must be emphasized that that we did not yet prove that just this mechanism is responsible for the telepathy and other ESP phenomena. Strictly speaking, it was indicated that such an ESP mechanism exist which is not supernatural, esoteric, but, on the other hand, is not based on the use of a kind of radiation. The missing proof can be obtained by the comparison of consequences of our theory with experimental results. Some indications of possible experimental ways to check the proposed theory are contained in this chapter. Some of them are based on the use of the theory of quantum states of mind (Temkin, 1999; 2011), as it is described in Sec 4 of the present article. Other experiments are not based on any theory as, for example, the examination the influence of screens or other obstacles preventing the electromagnetic or other kinds of radiation propagation, on the telepathy. According our theory the telepathy can exist even between two persons separated by metallic screens, layers of the earth, by water *etc.*. Good and unambiguous experiments on the telepathic communication between one person on the earth surface and the second in a submarine deep under water could be considered a serious test of the proposed theory. The second test could be telepathy experiments when the distance between two persons is extremely great, the best would be the use of cosmic distances, so that it would be impossible to explain the communication by electromagnetic or another radiation because even in the absence of the

absorption (really, the absorption exists) the intensity if a radiation decreases with the distance from the source increase as  $r^{-2}$ , and the brain of the sender of telepathems could be a very powerfull radio station to send telepathems (by electromagnetic radiation) which could be accepted by a recipient separated from him by so big distance. The third text (admittedly very difficult to execute) could be the measurement of the time of the telepathic propagation between two persons. The velocity of the propagation of a radiation cannot be more than the light velocity. Therefore, if the velocity of telepathem propagation is larger than the light velocity, it would be very serious argument in favour of our theory because the propagation of (human) waves of De Broglie is not connected with the transfer of the matter so its velocity is not limited by the light velocity.

The views presented and described in this chapter can be applied not only to human beings, but also to any system able to perform self-measureings that can be clasified into subsets so that self-measurements belonging to two different such subsets, are incompatible. Then complementarity and uncertainty principles exists for such a system, and it is expected that the proposed theory is valid. Possibly, animals, plants, some types of computers, as well as some kinds of cosmic objects are such systems. If it is correct, the telepathy can be expected between different object of such kind, e.g., between human beings and animals, human beings and plants, human beings and *quantum* Universe. Possibly, the psycho-kinetic effect can be understood in terms of the telepathy between human being and non-living body by human waves of De Broglie interaction with the quantum mechanical wave function of the non-living body. The Helmut Schmidt theory of psycho-kinetic effect based on the consideration of the collapse of the wave function, makes the proposed explanation of the psycho-kinetic effect reasonable. Perhaps the collapse of wave function can be described as a result of the information transfer from the human mind to this non-living object by the telepathy. But it is still only a hypothesis. It must build a theory of the considered information transfer by the telepathy to confirm or disprove it.



## References

- Bergmann G. The Logic of Quanta. Am J Phys 1947 ; 15: 397-408; 497-508.
- Birkhoff G and Neuman J von. The Logic of Quantum Mechanics. Ann Math 1936; 37: 823-843.
- Bohr N. The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory. Nature 1928; 121: 580-590
- Bohr N. Light and Life. Nature 1933; 131: 421-423
- Bohr N. Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature, Part 2, London, 1934.
- Bohr N. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? Phys Rev 1935; 48: 696-702
- Bohr N. Biology and Atomic Physics. Physical and Biological Memorial Congress of Louigi Galvani, Bologne. 1937; November; in Physics and Human Knowledge. John Willey & Sons, New York 1958, pp. 13-22.
- Dirac PAM. The Principles of Quantum Mechanics. Oxford at Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Einstein A. Zur Elektrodynamik der bewegter Körper. Ann der Physik 1905; 17: 891-921.
- Einstein A. The Meaning of Relativity. Princeton, 1953.
- Fock V. Konfigurationsraum und zweite Quantelung. Z für Phys. 1932; 75: 622-647.
- Heisenberg W. The Physical Principles of the Quantum Theory, Chicago, 1930
- Heitler W. The quantum theory of radiation. Oxford, At Clarendon Press, 1954
- Hunt D. Exploring The Occult. Ballantin Books, New York, 1964.
- Leek S. Telepathy. Collier Books, New York, 1971.
- Messia A. Quantum Mechanics. vol. 1 & 2, Amsterdam, 1961.
- Murphy G. Challenge of Psychical Research. A Primer Of Parapsychology. Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1961
- Parker A. States of mind. ESP and altered states of consciousness. Malaby Press, London, 1975
- Rhine LE. Psi, What Is This? Perrenial Library, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1975
- Rogo SD. Parapsychology. A Century of Inquiry. Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1975
- Sinclair U. Mental radio, Collier Books, New York, 1971
- Schiff LI. Quantum mechanics. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York - Toronto – London, 1955.
- Temkin AYa. Parapsychology from the Point of View of Modern Physics. European J Parapsychology 1982; 4: 257-280.
- Temkin AYa. Some ideas on information processing, thinking and genetics. Tel-Aviv University Press, Tel-Aviv. 1999. (available also at <http://www.eng.tau.ac.il/~temkin/>)
- Temkin AYa. Consciousness, Subconsciousness, Theory of Mind And Its Application. J. NeuroQuantology 2011; In press.

Copyright of NeuroQuantology is the property of NeuroQuantology and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.